

MINUTES
Danvers Board of Appeals

#17-4739

December 11, 2017

Present: Robert Cignetti, Rebecca Kilborn, John Boughner,
Jeffrey Sauer, Kenneth Scholes, Kenneth Jarvinen,
Anthony Podesta

Also Present: Building Inspector, Richard Maloney
Secretary, Marybeth Burak-Condon

STEVEN J. DEMPSEY (#17-4739) Requesting a finding to renovate and restore dwelling to create five townhouse style units in accordance with Sections 3.10.3 and 3.11 of the Danvers Zoning Bylaws at **11 NICHOLS STREET**

Clerk Sauer read an email from Diana Butler, 11 Spring Street stating her support of this project.

Attorney Nancy McCann said at the last meeting we gave a full presentation and received feedback from the board and the audience. The property currently has four residential units, it was constructed in 1860, and the applicant filed a finding to renovate the structure and put an addition on the structure and build five residential structures. We listened to what the board and the neighbors had to say about that plan and we have revised them, we have reduced the unit count down to four we have removed unit 5. We reduced the length of the four unit building by about 10 feet, we are still keeping the historic main core of the building, the parking is now fully conforming, and we have two 3-bedroom units and two 2-bedroom units which require 10 parking spaces. The addition that we are showing on the plan conforms to setbacks, the structure is no closer to Nichols Street than the existing structure, and we are still proposing to put in the sidewalk that we discussed at the last meeting. This plan has better parking circulation, better site distance and this is a vast improvement over the existing conditions. What we are proposing is not substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than what currently exists. I think that there may be some misinformation about this project that is circulating, so the land that we are talking about is not a piece of property that is being considered for Rail Trail improvements, it is adjacent to property that might be

considered for expansion of the Rail Trail but the site itself is not. No work with regard to this project was ever proposed in the wetlands, Unit 5 had been proposed in the buffer zone, and now with these renovations to the plan and revisions to the plan Unit 5 has been removed. This project was not denied at the last meeting and we are not appealing any decision that was made by the board we are in the process of a public hearing. This site is not a historic landmark it is a house that falls under the jurisdiction of the Preservation Commission if we were talking about demolishing it we are not demolishing it. We have four units for four and we have fewer bedrooms, so we are not going to see an increase in traffic circulation. Run off from this development is not going to create flooding this project has to go through site plan approval and part of that is a detailed review of storm water management and the regulations that apply to this project will be done by the town engineer.

John Boughner said are we going to lose the big tree in the front? Mr. Colantoni said the two trees in the front of the house will remain, there is a branch that will be removed, and there is a Charlie Brown Christmas tree that is dead in the front that will be removed. Mr. Boughner said the entire square footage? Mr. Colantoni said 3048 square feet.

Robert Cignetti said why do you need that townhouse look in the front? Mr. Colantoni said we are trying to get a Greek revival look to the whole building, the Preservation Committee spent a lot of time with us and they voted in favor of it because we are going to tie the units into it. We don't have the space for it because of the setback situations and the narrowness of the lot. Mr. Cignetti said these computer alcoves that's another name for a bedroom. Mr. Colantoni said we have them in all of our two bedroom units and we have done that in the past. He discussed the alcoves in further detail. Mr. Cignetti said how do I know they are not going to be bedrooms. Mr. Colantoni said we would be glad to take the closets out we are not trying to create another bedroom we are trying to create a work space. Mr. Cignetti said when you sell this you do not know what the owners are going to do with this, why not create more parking spaces. Attorney McCann said if you would like us to put more parking spaces in we can, what we heard at the last meeting was more green space. Mr. Cignetti said I mentioned at the last meeting where are guests going to park and you still haven't provided for them. Mr. Colantoni said we have more than we did at the last meeting at the end of the building there is a carport, it

has to meet the setback and that is actually two spaces for guests, we were trying to stay out of the buffer zone. Mr. Cignetti said I am just saying a gravel space for guests to park.

Rebecca Kilborn said so I am just making sure we now have 10 bedrooms, and right now you have two internal garages and you had three before? Mr. Colantoni said we had a garage in Unit 4 but because we took about 10 feet off the building we removed it because there would have been no way to do a proper entrance with the square footage that we had, we created the carport. Ms. Kilborn said we have 10 parking spaces, what kind of time frame? Mr. Colantoni said we will have to go through Site Review and Engineering, so 12 to 18 months.

Kenneth Scholes said I know we talked about a buffer between the property and the railway maybe a fence or something so no one is turning around in that area. Mr. Colantoni said we would be glad to do that but the Town of Danvers has given an easement to the abutting property and it is going right to the foundation, we want to keep that and if it becomes part of the Rail Trail we want that all to stay. Mr. Scholes said so there is no possibility of a fence there because of that easement. Mr. Colantoni said we could put a fence from the existing building down and that would help. Attorney McCann said again that would be under site plan but we could put a condition on it, we will be doing a landscaping plan and I suspect we will be adding landscaping in that area.

Kenneth Jarvinen said the original structure is 5000 square feet so this is increasing it by 2700 so we have roughly 7700? Mr. Colantoni said the actual living space will be about 7400.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

John Hebert, 4 Spring Street said I have been hearing that there are 4 existing units there now and 12 existing bedrooms, but what I received from the Assessor's Office description says 4 units, 4 bedrooms, 2 units are owner occupied, I'm seeing 4 one bedroom units according the Danvers Assessors Office. Mr. Maloney said it is definitely a legal four family. Mr. Boughner said this sometimes is an estimate. Mr. Hebert said two units were owner occupied so technically since 1959 this has been used as a three unit building. Mr. Boughner said on the town books it is a 4 unit building. Mr. Hebert said so you are increasing

it to 10 bedrooms and with the computer alcoves even more. I am not in favor of this, I agree the property needs to be restored but I would like to see a nice duplex with two or three bedrooms in each unit. There will be a lot of people living on that busy corner with no room for kids to play in the yard and a lot of cars coming in and out, this is a little too much.

Attorney McCann said this is a four unit structure, they are grandfathered there is no restriction on the number of occupants that can occupy this property now there is no restriction on the number of bedrooms there are in fact 12 bedrooms in this property they were observed by Preservation Commission we gave you photographs of all of those rooms. We've got a huge back yard that we are proposing now and there will be plenty of area to play. The sidewalk that we are proposing is a betterment that we are adding into this project and will be a huge improvement to people who use this area.

Ray Arsenault, 14 Nichols Street said the new plans that they are showing is substantially larger in the number of bedrooms, they are saying a computer alcove which has walls and a closet which looks like bedrooms, the amount of people who are going to be packed into that tiny area is quite substantially larger than it should be. Sticking with the colonial look to the houses is a much better idea, this looks like a hotel, you have a four family within that footprint and you want to keep it as a four family why do you have to go outside of the footprint. This is totally financial, it is a lot bigger than it should be and it is going to create an eyesore, a colonial look would be a great asset to the neighborhood. I am not in favor of this project. Also some of people who are on the 12 written agreements that say they agree with this, some of these people were given a different plan than what they are showing tonight.

George Rozopoulos, 53 Long Bow, said for years I have driven by that property and now people want to invest money to make it look nice and give people a new home, it was a four family, what about the people who lived there before, they are making it look better and everybody is concerned about people making money, I don't get it.

Homeowner, 70 Nichols Street, said I am new to the area what is the consideration as far as run-off on the site or to the wetland, what are the further discharges? Mr. Boughner said that will go before the Planning Board if it passes this board.

The homeowner said if you do decide to expand the parking will it be into the 100 foot buffer zone could they do pavers or something like that?

Rita Stone, 2 Palmer Avenue said I am in favor of this project I have been to all of Mr. Colantoni's properties I have no doubt this will be a quality project. This property is a four family deemed unsafe to inhabit, it is in a neighborhood of single family homes and other multi-family dwellings. I respect the Preservation Commissions determination to save the main part of the home for its Greek revival style it holds no other historical value. The restoration proposed will beautify the area and provide a long overdue update and overhaul that improve the neighborhood, I request that the board vote in favor of this project.

Geoff Tolmei said I live at 152 Water Street the recently converted condominiums it is a lovely community it has afforded 17 people to live in Danvers and it has definitely improved the entire neighborhood surrounding it. Based on what I have seen in this neighborhood I don't think that it is going to look like a commercial property, they have met the requirements of zoning and now they have adjusted their parking requirements. So I just think it is going to improve the esthetics of the neighborhood, there are other multi-families in the neighborhood and I think this is a plus for everyone involved.

James Wood, 7 Nichols Street said it looks like a motel I don't understand why they have to build it, it has historical value it's got a rich history and should be preserved, footprint for footprint and if they could keep it within the same boundaries as it is now, I am not in favor of this.

Brian Hebert, 4 Spring Street said I am opposed of the current plan, I delivered papers to this house and there were never more than three cars on the property, this will change the dynamics of the neighborhood and of this intersection.

Attorney McCann said this is not going to look like a motel it will fit in well with what is there now, we agree with restoration and all of that costs money and a project has to be financially viable in order for it to succeed, this project has no increase in the number of units, we have reduced the overall size as you requested us to do, we have the parking that meets the requirements, and this is going to be a beautiful gateway to

the Prep area as you come in on Nichols Street, and this project is certainly not substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than what we have there now.

John Boughner said could you take a condition for a paver's area, not crushed stone, for additional parking? Attorney McCann said yes, we would let that be at the discretion of the Planning Board.

Robert Cignetti said the gentlemen makes a good point about the computer alcoves is there a way that you can open those up so they are not bedrooms but an alcove? John Colantoni said if that is what we have to do we would be glad to do that, with that said I would prefer taking all of the closets out of them, but in my own home we used to have the computer room open unfortunately you get no work done because it is open, it's nice to have it enclosed. And using the pavers for the parking no problem with that I agree with him wholeheartedly.

Robert Cignetti said I will vote for this with two conditions that you remove the closets from the computer alcoves and that you provide more parking a minimum of two spaces.

Rebecca Kilborn said I appreciate the changes and the new plan, I am also in favor of this, I am going to disagree with Mr. Cignetti because we have had studies within the town regarding parking and they show we have too much parking, so with this number of units we now have 3 spaces for the three bedroom units and 2 spaces for the two bedroom units. I would prefer more greenspace than parking, I feel that the property is significantly deteriorated and any improvement would improve property values for everyone in that neighborhood and it would not be substantially more detrimental than what presently exists.

Kenneth Scholes said I think that we are all in agreement that something needs to be done with this building and now that we have eliminated the fifth unit in the back I think it looks great I will vote for it.

Jeffrey Sauer said I am struggling with whether this more detrimental than what presently exists because RII says you need 20,000 square feet to build one unit and you need at least 30,000 square feet to build a maximum of two units. We have four pre-existing units in a small footprint and I can't vote

for this much expansion of area in a lot, under normal circumstances they wouldn't be able to build anything, so I will not vote for it I think it's too big.

Kenneth Jarvinen said I like that they shaved off ten feet, I like the sidewalk, I think it will be much safer for pedestrians, I think I would vote for this as long as they take the closets out of the computer room.

Anthony Podesta said my issue is what Jeff said the goal of our zoning bylaws are to reduce and eventually eliminating nonconformity so four for four and the concerns of the people here and the footprint it is very large I would like to see something smaller closer to being in conformity with an R2 district.

John Boughner said I want to thank you for downsizing this, I would vote in favor of this I don't find this to have a hotel look I do feel that this will be an improvement to the neighborhood. Here is an opportunity with a quality builder, I do think that the planning board process will ferret anything out regarding landscaping, I think the sidewalk is much needed, I would vote in favor of this project.

Richard Maloney said you have a directive from Town Counsel, which is either do not grant the finding or you grant the finding with the condition that this finding is based on getting approval through Town Meeting either a land by purchase or a permanent easement. They discussed the portion of land that is on Town property. Attorney McCann said we will take the condition that Town Counsel has given you and I will be working with Town Counsel to get it resolved.

Robert Cignetti motioned to find that the proposed addition as shown on the plans increases the nonconformity. Rebecca Kilborn seconded. All in favor.

Robert Cignetti motioned to grant the finding for the proposed addition with three conditions, that the closets be removed from the alcove, that two additional parking spaces be provided with impervious surface, and that the applicants will obtain purchase or a permanent easement through Town Meeting. Rebecca Kilborn seconded. Jeffrey Sauer opposed. Vote 4-1.

MINUTES
Danvers Board of Appeals

#17-4741
December 11, 2017

Present: Robert Condon, Rebecca Kilborn, John Boughner,
Jeffrey Sauer, Kenneth Scholes, Kenneth Jarvinen,
Anthony Podesta

Also Present: Building Inspector, Richard Maloney
Secretary, Marybeth Burak-Condon

199 TURNPIKE LLC (17-4741) Requesting a variance to allow an indoor recreation and sports entertainment facility in accordance with Section 6, Table 1 of the Danvers Zoning Bylaws at **199 NEWBURY STREET**

Joe Yiakas said I am a partner of 199 Turnpike LLC, I am looking for a use variance from the Table of Allowable Uses and I would like to add go-karts, we would like to use the space as recreational entertainment and indoor sports for future tenants. Mr. Boughner said wasn't this an indoor baseball facility at one point? Mr. Yiakas said it still is but talking to the Building Inspector he advised us to come here for clarification because it has always been a use variance. Mr. Boughner said you have multiple tenants besides the baseball facility. Mr. Yiakas said the breakdown is 60,000 square feet total, the Route 1 Sportsplex is about 40,000 and there are three smaller tenants, Carpet Liquidators, the Canine Edge and the North Shore Performance Training. Mr. Boughner said and one of those tenants is going to downsize? Mr. Yiakas said the Sportsplex is going to downsize to 10,000 square feet. We wanted another tenant in the 30,000 square feet, this is not your typical go-karts it is drifting. Peter Kneeland said there is F1 and K1 racing but they are for speed racing this is more of a slower experience and drifting it is a much slower speed with drifting, and there are none that exist in Massachusetts right now.

Kenneth Jarvinen said what exactly is drifting. Mr. Kneeland said it is sliding more like ice skating at a slower speed. Mr. Jarvinen said you have all of the safety protocol? Mr. Kneeland said yes.

Jeffrey Sauer said are these cars electric or gasoline? Mr. Kneeland said gasoline, there will be an air extraction system. I have already talked with the Fire Department and Zoning so yes we will have everything required for safety.

Rebecca Kilborn said where is this now? Mr. Kneeland said they started a niche in 1987 in New Zealand, I spoke with the owner and I decided to bring it to Boston. Ms. Kilborn said so there are none in the United States? Mr. Kneeland said you will be the first to experience drift kart racing. Ms. Kilborn said I remember that we had a lot of discussion about this building in the back and the renovations so I am going to defer to the Building Inspector just to find out if everything has been resolved. Mr. Maloney said there was an issue with the gas easement and that was squared away and that addition is all done and signed off. The only thing that I did here was that I suggested to the owner it was a tennis place by variance originally in the 70's then they came back and got the baseball and softball in there in the 90's so we have a catchall phase for any kind of entertainment, indoor, recreation sport, so I suggested that he ask for the variance to alter the original variance or in lieu of that just go under the umbrella of recreation sports and get a variance for that definition and then if he changes tenants as long as it falls under it then he won't have to come back to ZBA every time.

Robert Cignetti said so the softball fields are going? Mr. Yiakas said the field house where the turf is will be transitioning over, the batting cages for baseball and softball will stay. Mr. Cignetti said where they have the softball games are out and you are still going to keep where they have the parties? Mr. Yiakas said correct. Mr. Cignetti said this will be 12 months a year. When this drifting goes on is it two cars side by side, are the cars going to be bumping into each other? Mr. Kneeland said they can possibly bump into each other, they are now separate lanes, they are really slow, and about 12 to 15 cars are staggered. Mr. Cignetti asked how many cars can go side by side across. Mr. Kneeland said about 6 or 7 the cars are tiny. We let them out one at a time they come from the pit and drive out one at a time. Mr. Cignetti said so that can't happen then? Mr. Kneeland said unless everybody stands still, and we won't allow that there are always two people that will be on the track. Mr. Cignetti said what I am getting at is that you've got kids driving these things and they don't have driving licenses and I can see just for the fun of it crashing into each

other. Mr. Kneeland said the New Zealand location has been open since 1987 and there was never a report of an accident or anyone getting injured and the reason being is since its drifting it goes significantly slower than a traditional go-kart. Mr. Cignetti said so the point is in the tail swinging around and drifting. Mr. Kneeland said yes and people do spin around and you hit a tire or two but it is at a very slow speed.

John Boughner said you keep talking about slow speed what is the top speed? Mr. Kneeland said the top speed on the straight away is about 15 mph. Mr. Boughner said I can see with any kind of new thing if it takes off and becomes popular you will get inundated and what can your facility handle for parking currently? Mr. Yiakas said it has over 100 parking spaces, from what Peter is telling me I cannot see more than a couple of dozen people there at any one time. Mr. Boughner said what are the hours of operation? Mr. Kneeland said on the weekdays it is 10-9 and the weekends 10-11. Mr. Boughner said the minimum age is 16? Mr. Kneeland said between 14-16. Mr. Boughner said and a waiver is required? Mr. Kneeland said yes. Mr. Yiakas said I think under the Table of Allowable Uses the definition is Recreation Entertainment Indoor Sports. Mr. Boughner said you are looking for us to broaden this.

There were no questions or comments from the audience.

Anthony Podesta said I am in favor of this and it is an interesting idea and it will make use of the space that you have.

Kenneth Jarvinen said I would vote for this.

Jeffrey Sauer said I would vote for this.

Kenneth Scholes said I have no problem with them changing this to Recreation/Entertainment/Indoor Sports Facility.

Rebecca Kilborn said I will vote for this.

Robert Cignetti said I too will vote for this.

John Boughner said to me this makes sense you are on the highway, you've got the parking and with any luck this business takes off.

Robert Cignetti motioned to allow the applicant to allow indoor go-kart racing and also to align current use and future use with the Town Zoning Table of Allowable Uses under the category of Recreation/Entertainment/Indoor Sport Facility at the discretion of the Building Inspector for future tenants, the hardship is the location of the building; this condition does not affect other [properties or structures] in the same zoning district; a literal enforcement of the zoning bylaws would involve a substantial hardship to the applicant; and granting this variance will not create a substantial detriment to the public good and will not nullify or substantially derogate from the intent or purpose of the zoning bylaws. Rebecca Kilborn seconded. All in favor.

MINUTES
Danvers Board of Appeals

#17-4742

December 11, 2017

Present: Rebecca Kilborn, John Boughner, Jeffrey Sauer,
Kenneth Scholes, Kenneth Jarvinen, Anthony
Podesta

Also Present: Building Inspector, Richard Maloney
Secretary, Marybeth Burak-Condon

MEREDITH AND ALEXANDER NICHOLS (17-4742) Requesting a variance from front setback to erect an addition in accordance with Table 2 of the Danvers Zoning Bylaws at **9 SHAWMUT AVENUE**

Robert Cignetti recused himself from this application, the Chair appointed Kenneth Jarvinen to vote.

Ms. Nichols said we would like to add a shed dormer on the back of our home, we are asking relief from the front setback and we already have a walkup attic so it's just a shed dormer in the back.

Mr. Boughner said you are basically adding a dormer and you are not increasing the setback. The applicant said yes.

Rebecca Kilborn said so the nonconformity is in the front of the house and the shed dormer will be in the back.

Kenneth Scholes said so they were already nonconforming with the front setback is that correct. Mr. Nichols said yes. Mr. Scholes said the roof edge is going to extend three feet higher? Ms. Nichols said yes.

John Boughner asked about the ceiling height.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Charles Herbeck, 7 Shawmut Avenue stated he is in favor of this application.

Rebecca Kilborn said I will vote for this

Kenneth Scholes said I have no problem with this.

Jeffrey Sauer said I will vote for this.

Kenneth Jarvinen said I will vote for this.

Anthony Podesta said I will vote for this.

John Boughner said I will as well.

Rebecca Kilborn motioned to grant the variance to add a shed dormer as shown on the plans submitted, the hardship is the location of the structure on the lot; this condition does not affect other [properties or structures] in the same zoning district; a literal enforcement of the zoning bylaws would involve a substantial hardship to the applicant; and granting this variance will not create a substantial detriment to the public good and will not nullify or substantially derogate from the intent or purpose of the zoning bylaws. Kenneth Scholes seconded. All in favor.

MINUTES
Danvers Board of Appeals

#17-4743

December 11, 2017

Present: Robert Cignetti, Rebecca Kilborn, John Boughner,
Jeffrey Sauer, Kenneth Scholes, Kenneth Jarvinen,
Anthony Podesta

Also Present: Building Inspector, Richard Maloney
Secretary, Marybeth Burak-Condon

50 HOBART STREET DANVERS, LLC (#17-4743) Requesting a variance and a finding to allow the renovation of one single family home and one duplex on the lot in accordance with Table 2, Section 1.2.2 and Section 3.10 of the Danvers Zoning Bylaws at **50 HOBART STREET**

Chair Boughner recused himself from this application and appointed Robert Cignetti to sit as Chairman. Robert Cignetti appointed Anthony Podesta to vote on this application.

Attorney Nancy McCann said I am here with the owners of the property and the project engineer. We are requesting relief to allow the renovation of this site, there is an existing structure that is close to the street and in 2011 there was an addition to the back of the site. In 2011 the owner had a proposal to remove the 1900 historic structure, it went through the Historic Preservation Commission to allow the demolition of that structure and a duplex was proposed in the back. The parking for that duplex was all going to be located in the front of the property. When you look at the minutes from that meeting there was a lot of disagreement from the board members with putting the parking in the front and the duplex in the back and getting rid of the ugly historic structure, that application was ultimately withdrawn by the applicant then, and this addition was put on in the back. The addition that was put on in 2012 is fully conforming to the setback requirements. After the addition was put on there were various people who lived in this structure over a period of time but it has been vacant for years. The applicant purchased this property in October and since then has done some sprucing up to make it look better, I have some photographs, it was overgrown and not in particular good shape. What we are proposing to do is make better use of

what is there right now and bring needed housing into this area. We are proposing to separate the large massive structure into two smaller structures by eliminating this connecting piece in the middle. Taking the front historic structure that was built 1900 and the attached garage and keeping it and turn this into a unit that contains two bedrooms. We are planning to remove the connector and put a duplex in the back with two units each with two bedrooms, so we end up with three two-bedroom units on this site. You did receive with the application some different perspectives of what is being proposed, we are providing circulation around the site, we need six parking spaces and we are providing seven.

Joe Small, Hancock Engineering said we have one existing driveway on the left side of the house and that will remain unchanged, we are planning on paving around between the two buildings to allow access to the additional four parking spaces and being able to come out through the second curb cut. What we are trying to do is minimize the amount of parking in the rear of the property and keep it as green as possible.

Robert Cignetti said right now that is a single family house. When this was proposed the owner wanted to put a duplex on the back and the board wanted to downsize it, they thought the garage was too big and the owner left and withdrew and built this abomination he kept within the setbacks and built it as a matter of right.

Rebecca Kilborn said so this would be a variance, is this a use variance? Attorney McCann said no there is a single family and a duplex so the use is permitted by right in this zoning district but we have more than one structure on a lot but the only reason we need that is because we are disconnecting it. We think it lays out better and it looks better so we will remove that, we are seeking a variance to have two structures on one lot and a finding because the front setback is pre-existing nonconforming.

Kenneth Scholes said how many buildings are in all these buildings that are called a one family now? Attorney McCann said I have existing floor plans, there are currently three bedrooms and two baths right now. Mr. Scholes said and you are proposing six. Mr. Scholes said and you are removing the tree there is no way to keep it, why can't you drive on the left side

of it and park on the right side of it. Mr. Small said that would be a tight squeeze.

Jeffrey Sauer said did you consider putting the parking in that big back area and not paving everything you can see from Hobart Street. Mr. Small said we were trying to keep the backyard open. Mr. Sauer said in doing that you are taking away green on Hobart.

Anthony Podesta said where would you enter the rear building? They discussed where the stairs were located.

Robert Cignetti said are you going to stay exactly within what is there? Attorney McCann said correct.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Marguerite Parkman, 48 Hobart Street, discussed the history of the property, stating it has never been finished, and it has rodents living in it. She said she was not in favor of this proposal.

Paul Lock, 54 Hobart Street said I don't begrudge the owners to make a deal or profit, I can walk through here and to back out of the driveway you cannot without going on the neighbor's property, this is horrible the way it is and it is going to take away from my property value, to make this and put a duplex in the back I am not in favor.

Beverly Palmquist, 5 Pickering Place said our whole backyard is this lovely duplex about 10 feet away, I thought in 2011 there was a denial. Mr. Cignetti said the applicant withdrew. Ms. Palmquist said this is a single family home lot, I am totally against having a three family next to me and I am against this proposal.

Bill Bradstreet said I object to what is there now but it cannot be changed and looking at the drawing they want to add a second driveway, one is bad enough and two on that narrow lot just makes a bad situation worse.

Paul Lock said originally it was my understanding that when they put that addition on it was going to be used for the two elderly women who were family members and that is how it turned out the way that it was. It doesn't make sense to me that it originally

had one intended purpose and now it has a different purpose as a duplex. Mr. Cignetti said it is a single family house and that is how the board is going to treat it.

Attorney McCann said I don't disagree that the neighborhood has been through some difficulty with this property, since it has been vacant for so long. How this addition went on was legal because it meets the setbacks, is it unattractive it probably is, what we are trying to do by eliminating the connector is trying to make a better use of it. Mr. Cignetti said this is in RI so you have enough to put a two family house on this property.

Rebecca Kilborn said I don't particularly like it, it is almost like we are trying to make something out of something that wasn't right and now are asking to make three units out of something that was one because it is already there. The second floor was never finished, I just don't like it I wouldn't vote for it.

Kenneth Scholes said I did drive in that driveway on the left hand side and it is ridiculously small, I don't like that I don't like the driveway on the right I don't like losing the oak tree. Like Becky said it is a monstrosity that we are trying to fix, I would not vote for it the way that it is.

Jeffrey Sauer said we are trying to make things comply more than what presently exists and this is RI single family houses and in my mind making one house into three is not going in the direction of improving compliance. We have all heard from the neighbors and they hate the idea of a three family so I won't vote for it.

Kenneth Jarvinen said the way that it is now does not function and to take out that connector it makes sense, and I would vote for it as long as the driveway was cleared up and made safe.

Anthony Podesta said I would have to agree with the other board members we want to vote towards compliance and not away from it, I don't like the current driveway, I don't like the new driveway so on a whole on this project I would not vote for it.

Robert Cignetti said this building as it stands is an abomination but it's there and what we are looking for in a finding is adding three units to this building, is it

substantially more detrimental than what is there, I think it is so I wouldn't vote for this.

Attorney McCann said I would like to take into consideration all that we heard tonight and continue to January 8, 2018.

Rebecca Kilborn motioned to allow the applicant to continue to January 8, 2018. Kenneth Scholes seconded. All in favor.

*Rebecca Kilborn motioned to adjourn. Kenneth Scholes seconded. All in favor.